



## Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.  
GENERAL

CBD/SBSTTA/REC/XXI/2  
14 December 2017

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

SUBSIDIARY BODY ON SCIENTIFIC,  
TECHNICAL AND TECHNOLOGICAL ADVICE

Twenty-first meeting  
Montreal, Canada, 11-14 December 2017  
Agenda item 4

### RECOMMENDATION ADOPTED BY THE SUBSIDIARY BODY ON SCIENTIFIC, TECHNICAL AND TECHNOLOGICAL ADVICE

#### **XXI/2. Sustainable wildlife management: guidance for a sustainable wild meat sector<sup>1</sup>**

*The Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice*

1. *Takes note* of the draft voluntary guidance for a sustainable wild meat sector,<sup>2</sup> applicable to some areas of terrestrial tropical and subtropical habitat, biomes and ecosystems, prepared in accordance with decision XIII/8, paragraph 5(a);

2. *Requests* the Executive Secretary to finalize the technical study entitled “Towards a sustainable, participatory and inclusive wild meat sector”,<sup>3</sup> following the peer review by Parties and other Governments and other relevant stakeholders;

3. *Also requests* the Executive Secretary, in collaboration with interested Parties, other members of the Collaborative Partnership on Sustainable Wildlife Management, and indigenous peoples and local communities, subject to the availability of resources, to convene and facilitate dialogues to review the draft voluntary guidance and address related issues, as appropriate, in the light of regional needs and circumstances;

4. *Further requests* the Executive Secretary to report on progress to the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice at its twenty-second meeting and to the Conference of the Parties at its fourteenth meeting;

5. *Requests* the Executive Secretary to communicate to the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services the priority that the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice gives to the thematic assessment on sustainable use and conservation of biodiversity;

6. *Recommends* that the Conference of the Parties adopt a decision along the following lines:

*The Conference of the Parties,*

*Recalling* decision XIII/8,

<sup>1</sup> For some Parties, sustainable wild meat practices are not considered a sector of the economy.

<sup>2</sup> At its eleventh meeting, the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity defined “bushmeat” (or “wild meat”) hunting more broadly as “the harvesting of wild animals in tropical and sub-tropical countries for food and for non-food purposes, including for medicinal use” (see [decision XI/25](#)). Given that wildlife hunting for food and livelihoods affects over 500 wild vertebrate species in Oceania, South America, South and South-East Asia as well as sub-Saharan Africa, the [Second World Conservation Congress](#), held in October 2000, in its Resolution 2.64, refers to the issue of “wild meat” rather than “bushmeat” hunting.

<sup>3</sup> [CBD/SBSTTA/21/INF/6](#).

*Recognizing* that the sustainable use of biodiversity, including management of wild species, contributes to the achievement of several Aichi Biodiversity Targets and Sustainable Development Goals,

*Also recognizing* the implications of human population growth and urbanization for biodiversity conservation and land management,

*Aware* that Parties have identified integrated wildlife management needs in their national biodiversity strategies and action plans and in other national, regional and global strategies and plans, and that a number of sustainable wildlife management<sup>4</sup> activities are under way with support from various Governments and organizations, and *noting* that many wildlife species are still in need of urgent conservation measures, including protection, sustainable utilization and restoration of populations,

*Welcoming* the progress made by the Collaborative Partnership on Sustainable Wildlife Management,

*Recognizing* the right to customary use of biological resources, in accordance with the traditional practices, and the importance of full and effective participation of indigenous peoples and local communities in decision-making processes related to sustainable wildlife management in accordance with national legislation,

*Also recognizing* the significant role that indigenous peoples and local communities play in the sustainable use and management of wild meat,

*Building* on the Plan of Action on Customary Sustainable Use of Biological Diversity, endorsed by the Conference of the Parties at its twelfth meeting,<sup>5</sup>

*Recalling* the urgent need to reduce biodiversity loss, including preventing the extinction of threatened species, to improve and sustain their conservation status and to restore and safeguard ecosystems that provide essential functions and services, including services related to water, health, livelihoods and well-being,

*Having* considered the progress report prepared in line with recommendation XXI/2 on sustainable wildlife management: guidance for a sustainable wild meat sector,

1. *[Welcomes]/[Takes note of]* the voluntary guidance for a sustainable wild meat sector, contained in the annex to the present decision,<sup>6</sup> with the aim of promoting the sustainability of supply at the source, managing the demand along the entire value chain, and creating the enabling conditions for legal, sustainable management of terrestrial wild meat in tropical and subtropical habitats, taking into account the traditional use by indigenous peoples and local communities without adversely affecting their livelihoods;

2. *Notes* that the voluntary guidance for a sustainable wild meat sector can contribute to improving integrated wildlife management aspects reflected in Sustainable Development Goals 2 and 15,<sup>7</sup> for terrestrial wildlife, with a view to enhancing policy coherence across biodiversity-related conventions<sup>8</sup> and other conservation agreements;

---

<sup>4</sup> Sustainable wildlife management (SWM) is “the sound management of wildlife species to sustain their populations and habitat over time, considering the socio-economic needs of human populations”. Wildlife, if sustainably managed, can provide both long-term nutrition and sustained income to local communities, therefore contributing considerably to local livelihoods as well as safeguarding human and environmental health (Collaborative Partnership on Sustainable Wildlife Management, 2015).

<sup>5</sup> [Decision XII/12](#) B, annex.

<sup>6</sup> Note: the annex may be revised in the light of the work pursuant to recommendation XXI/2 on sustainable wildlife management: guidance for a sustainable wild meat sector.

<sup>7</sup> See [General Assembly resolution 70/1](#) of 25 September 2015 entitled “Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development”.

<sup>8</sup> See <https://www.cbd.int/brc/>

3. *Encourages* Parties, other Governments and relevant organizations, including other biodiversity-related conventions and conservation agreements, where applicable, and in accordance with national circumstances and national legislation, to make use of the voluntary guidance for a sustainable wild meat sector, as well as the Plan of Action on Customary Sustainable Use of Biological Diversity and the Sustainable Development Goals,<sup>5</sup> when developing, revising and implementing governance approaches on wildlife and when developing and updating national development plans and national biodiversity strategies and action plans;

4. *Invites* Parties to provide, on a voluntary basis, best practices from their existing national programmes that promote sustainable wildlife management, while contributing to poverty reduction, food security and employment generation, in line with the Sustainable Development Goals and sustainable use of biological diversity;

5. *Also invites* Parties to provide information on their activities and results arising from the consideration of the voluntary guidance for a sustainable wild meat sector;

6. *Encourages* Parties to undertake cross-sectoral dialogues and joint trainings on sustainable wildlife management, among the forestry, agriculture, veterinary and public health, natural resources, finance, rural development, education, legal and private sectors, as well as indigenous peoples and local communities, and other relevant stakeholders with a view to promoting the application of the voluntary guidance for a sustainable wild meat sector;

7. *Invites* Parties, and *encourages* other Governments and other relevant organizations that are in a position to do so, to support capacity-building initiatives for developing countries, aimed at enhancing the implementation of the voluntary guidance for a sustainable wild meat sector;

8. *Requests* the Executive Secretary to compile the submissions referred to in paragraph 5 above and make them available through the clearing-house mechanism;

9. *Requests* the Executive Secretary, in consultation with interested Parties, other Governments, indigenous peoples and local communities, and other members of the Collaborative Partnership on Sustainable Wildlife Management, subject to the availability of resources:

(a) To identify areas that may require complementary guidance to be developed and to explore ways to apply such guidance to other geographical areas, other species and other uses, in view of the fact that the voluntary guidance for a sustainable wild meat sector is applicable only to some areas of terrestrial tropical and subtropical habitat, biomes and ecosystems;

(b) To promote and facilitate the use of monitoring tools and databases, through an exchange of best practices and lessons learned, among Parties, other Governments and relevant organizations, with a view to improving information on sustainable wildlife use, including wild meat hunting, consumption, trade and sales, and legality issues;

(c) To further test multidisciplinary approaches to combining better knowledge of the use of and trade in wildlife, taking into account the knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous peoples and local communities and livelihood alternatives for the customary sustainable use of wildlife, possibly including an understanding of the taxonomy and ecology of the species involved, a review and strengthening of legal frameworks, the identification and promotion of best practices for sustainably managing and using wildlife, and an examination of the provisions of food and livelihood alternatives relating to customary sustainable use of wildlife through, among other things, a review of existing activities relating to the Partnership;

(d) To communicate with the Executive Secretary of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services with a view to facilitating the wide dissemination of the outcomes of the assessment on sustainable use and conservation of biodiversity in order to help strengthen capacities and tools;

(e) To report on the progress of activities listed in paragraph 9 (a) through (d) above to the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice at a meeting held prior to the fifteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

*Annex*

**VOLUNTARY GUIDANCE FOR A SUSTAINABLE WILD MEAT SECTOR<sup>9</sup>**

**CONTEXT: WILD MEAT, FOOD SECURITY, AND LIVELIHOODS**

1. Wild animal hunting can be undertaken for subsistence, commercial, and recreational purposes. In subsistence hunting, the benefits obtained from wildlife (particularly food) are directly consumed or used by the hunter and his or her family. Further, the food security and livelihoods of many rural people in the tropics and subtropics depends on the use and trade of wild animals.<sup>10</sup>
2. Wild meat has long served as a source of nutrition for millions of people in many regions of the world, in both developed and developing countries. For example, in some rural communities in tropical developing countries, wild meat has been found to provide almost all of the protein in the diet. In Central Africa, it is estimated that over 4 million tons of wild meat are consumed each year, most of it supplying urban areas.<sup>11</sup>
3. Increased exploitation of the resource has been driven by growing human populations, advances in hunting technologies and the emergence of a booming commercial wild meat trade. Unprecedented extraction rates cause the decline of numerous wildlife populations and endanger foundation species critical to the functioning of ecosystems. Illegal and unregulated harvesting, increased hunting pressure, alongside rising rates of habitat destruction and conversion in tropical forest regions, make it highly likely that wild meat supplies in some tropical and subtropical countries will diminish.
4. The loss of wildlife will impact the availability of animal protein and fat sources for countless numbers of people and also initiate cascading alterations of ecosystems as species that play important ecosystem functions (e.g., seed dispersal, seed predation, control of prey species) are eliminated through overhunting. This loss of ecological interactions creates an internal imbalance of the ecosystem that in turn gravely reduces ecosystem functions and services, including provision of pharmaceutical compounds, biocontrol agents, food resources and disease regulation.<sup>12</sup> Moreover, between 23 and 36 per cent of birds, mammals, and amphibians used for food or medicine are now threatened with extinction.<sup>13</sup>
5. Increasing human population and trade from rural to urban areas, compounded with the lack of any sizeable domestic meat sector which might provide a substitute for wild meat, are the main drivers of unsustainable levels of hunting. Even where provincial town consumers have access to domesticated sources of meat, they are typically imported and/or expensive, and wild meat remains an important part of the diet. In large metropolitan areas located far from sources of wildlife, wild meat is no longer a dietary necessity for families but, in some traditional and cultural contexts, remains an important luxury or an occasional consumed good.

---

<sup>9</sup> For some Parties, sustainable wild meat practices are not considered a sector of the economy.

<sup>10</sup> The information document on sustainable wildlife management prepared for the twentieth meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice ([UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/20/INF/46](#)) includes an overview of the role of subsistence hunting in human societies, the impacts of subsistence and commercial hunting (including the combined impacts of hunting and land-use change as a result of agricultural and industrial activity), and an analysis based on the theories regarding the management of common pool resources. Additional information relating to national reports of Parties and national biodiversity strategies and action plans and sustainable use of wildlife was also made available in another information document ([UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/20/INF/47](#)).

<sup>11</sup> See [UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/20/11](#), para. 26

<sup>12</sup> S.S. Myers et al. (2013). *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 110, 18753-18760.

<sup>13</sup> S.H.M. Butchart et al. (2010). *Science* 328, 1164–1168.

6. Concurrently, habitat for wildlife is declining as lands are converted for agricultural commodities to meet the demands of a growing human population, natural resource extraction (e.g. timber, mining), and expanding human settlements. Land-use conversion can also reduce the size of the customary hunting grounds of indigenous peoples and local communities, exerting greater pressure on remaining wildlife resources within increasingly smaller territories, and often also impacting the legitimacy and effectiveness of customary hunting laws. However, more attention should be given to the positive contributions that relate to livelihood benefits, local economic growth and connections to climate change adaptation, which can provide incentives for the improved management of wildlife resources.

7. Wildlife species are typically undervalued, based on productivity and size, as compared to domesticated animals. However, in some contexts, wildlife may be quite competitive with livestock, particularly once higher value uses, such as eco-tourism, hunting, meat and other benefits produced, are taken into account.

8. Given that unsustainable hunting for wild meat is deemed a major threat to the ecology of tropical and subtropical ecosystems, directly affecting many endangered species, as well as indigenous peoples and local communities' livelihoods, food security and health, there is an urgent need to strengthen public policy responses within a more integrated socioeconomic, cultural, ecological and public health framework.

9. Mitigating the effects of overhunting is a complex issue. The reasons for wild meat overexploitation are manifold and these can vary considerably between regions. Often, a complex web of factors exists, contributing to increased wild meat demand and consequent resource overexploitation. These factors may include employment availability, property rights issues, the role of institutions, lack of incentives for managing the resource sustainably, migration, failures of crop harvests and availability of food from livestock, weather patterns and climate change, logging and resource extraction, overgrazing, urban sprawl, natural disasters, displacement, poaching, illegal trade war and strife. Land-use change for agricultural and industrial needs also has a major impact on wildlife habitat and wildlife behaviour. Moreover, though relatively little is known about host ecology, dynamics and the disease risk to people in contact with hunted wildlife, there is enough evidence to suggest that wildlife is an important reservoir of zoonotic pathogens that can present a clear public health risk of epidemics.<sup>14</sup> Certain wild meat species are likely to provoke pathogen spillover to humans, and this risk could increase through the unregulated and uncontrolled butchering and skinning of wild animals used for meat. Multisectoral approaches combining appropriate policy mechanisms from the agricultural, biodiversity, food security, health, infrastructure, mining and logging sectors, are therefore required for successful sustainable wildlife management.

10. Approaches for sustainable wildlife management should include: (a) analysis of national policies, (b) improving knowledge of the use and trade of wild meat species, and understanding of the ecology of species involved; (c) review and strengthening of legal frameworks, to design policy and management frameworks that incentivize and enable sustainable management; (d) the identification of opportunities and barriers for providing sustainably produced food and livelihood alternatives; (e) taking into account the use and traditions of indigenous peoples and local communities, and (f) appropriate enforcement capacity. With these combined and incorporated into solid national and regional wild meat strategies, there is a potential to achieve more sustainable use of wildlife for food.

## **II. SCOPE AND PURPOSE**

### **A. Scope**

11. Sustainable wildlife management refers to the sound management of wildlife species to sustain their populations and habitat over time, considering the socioeconomic needs of human populations. Wildlife, if sustainably managed, can provide both long-term nutrition and sustained income to indigenous peoples and local communities, therefore contributing considerably to local livelihoods as well as safeguarding human and environmental health.

---

<sup>14</sup> Zoonotic pathogens such as the Ebola, Marburg virus, and monkey pox.

12. The present guidance focuses on wild meat – defined for the purposes of this present guidance as the meat of terrestrial vertebrates in tropical and subtropical habitat, biomes and ecosystems which is used for food.<sup>15</sup> This may be considered synonymous with the term “bushmeat”. Freshwater and marine fish, and in some situations invertebrates, are also important nutritional resources, but are not covered by the present guidance.

## B. Goal and objective

13. The present guidance provides a technical guide aimed at enhancing governance for a sustainable, participatory and inclusive wild meat sector in the tropics and subtropics. Interventions specific to rural, urban and international contexts are presented to help reduce the loss of biodiversity, particularly that of wild species used for food, as well as to improve the sustainable use of wild meat for human well-being.

14. The overall objective of the present guidance is to facilitate the development of integrated policy measures, to prioritize and incorporate actions to improve the sustainability of wild meat use and further implement the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, in particular Aichi Biodiversity Targets 4, 7, 12 and 18.<sup>16</sup>

15. The information contained in the present guidance thus contributes to the achievement of objectives and commitments under the Convention on Biological Diversity<sup>17</sup> and other conventions, including the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (CMS), the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES), as well as the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.<sup>18</sup>

16. While many of the types of actions suggested in the present guidance can be undertaken in the short term, sustainable wildlife management involves sustained activities over the medium and long term. Therefore, the actions identified in the present note should be undertaken in the context of the 2050 Vision of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

17. More specifically the guidance aims to support the work of Parties as well as relevant organizations and initiatives to promote, implement and accelerate integrated action to:

- (a) Ensure that the supply of wild meat is sustainably and legally managed at the source;
- (b) Reduce demand for unsustainably managed and/or illegal wild meat in towns and cities;
- (c) Create an enabling environment for the sustainable management of wild meat.

18. The technical guidance within the present note can be used by various ministries, decision makers, as well as planning and implementing agencies at the national level. Due to the complexity of the issue and

---

<sup>15</sup> Based on the scope of work on wild meat (or “wild meat”) carried out in accordance with past decisions regarding the Convention’s programme of work on forest biodiversity, the focus of this report is on wild animals in tropical and subtropical forests used for food. This present guidance excludes a focus on non-food purposes, including medicinal uses. Information document [UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/20/INF/46](#) provides a broader analysis on non-domesticated terrestrial mammals, birds, reptiles and amphibians harvested for food or other purposes.

<sup>16</sup> Aichi Biodiversity Target 4 aims to achieve or have implemented plans for sustainable production and consumption and keep the impacts of use of natural resources well within safe ecological limits by 2020. Target 7 calls for the sustainable management of areas under agriculture, aquaculture and forestry, ensuring conservation of biodiversity by 2020. Target 12 ultimately aims to prevent the extinction of known threatened species and to improve and sustain their conservation status, particularly for those most in decline, by 2020. Target 18 to promote traditional knowledge and the full participation of indigenous peoples and local communities.

<sup>17</sup> In particular, Article 10 ([Sustainable Use of Components of Biological Diversity](#)), which requires Parties, as far as possible and as appropriate, to: (a) integrate consideration of the conservation and sustainable use of biological resources into national decision-making; (b) adopt measures relating to the use of biological resources to avoid or minimize adverse impacts on biological diversity; (c) protect and encourage customary use of biological resources in accordance with traditional cultural practices that are compatible with conservation or sustainable use requirements; (d) support local populations to develop and implement remedial action in degraded areas where biological diversity has been reduced; and (e) encourage cooperation between its governmental authorities and its private sector in developing methods for sustainable use of biological resources.

<sup>18</sup> See [General Assembly resolution 70/1](#) of 25 September 2015 entitled “Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development”.

its many cross-sectoral dimensions, the present guidance proposes joint approaches that can be applied to achieve sustainable use of wild meat species. The information therein supports continued dialogue, learning and methodological exchanges on sustainable wildlife management among forest, agriculture, natural resources, veterinary and public health, finance, rural development and legal sectors.

### **III. TECHNICAL GUIDANCE FOR ACHIEVING A SUSTAINABLE WILD MEAT SECTOR**

19. The guidance comprises a comprehensive set of recommendations to achieve a sustainable wild meat sector with a focus on how to work with actors to improve the sustainability of the supply (subsection A); how to reduce the demand for unsustainably managed wild meat along the whole value chain (subsection B); and how to create the enabling conditions for legal and regulated, sustainable management of wild meat (subsection C). The guidance also suggests steps and approaches that can be applied, by Parties and other Governments, in collaboration with relevant organizations, building on decision XI/25, and in accordance with national legislation, circumstances and priorities.

#### **A. Managing and improving the sustainability of wild meat supply at the source**

20. In commonly used lands, hunting is often governed by local and often informal rules establishing who can hunt and where hunting can take place. Challenges arise in the enforcement of such rules where local leaders are not empowered to control access to their land by external hunters or where hunters have lost their rights to legally hunt or participate in wildlife management, or else where the social structure of local communities has been eroded by several external historical factors (such as colonialism, immigration). In these contexts, individual hunters (both within and external to local communities) tend to compete with other hunters for this finite resource. This competition can prompt the harvesting of a wild species as quickly as possible, driving the species to local extinction. Therefore, the rules governing wildlife use for food needs to recognize rights for subsistence hunting, provide for the management of wildlife and determine which activities are considered legal or illegal. Responsive enforcement is an integral component of such rules. Procedurally, a participatory process with two way consultations involving indigenous peoples and local communities is required.

21. Several models for management of wildlife resources at the community level have been suggested and tested. These models are meant as examples as possible approaches, but may not be applicable in all countries or settings. Generally, these represent forms of co-management between communities and the state and/or private sector entities involved, such as those in infrastructure and extractive industries such as road construction, logging and mining. Forms of co-management between communities and the State and/or private companies, according to national legislation, inter alia, may include:

(a) Community hunting zones, which can be used to regulate hunting in settlements bordering protected areas or industrial concessions. Hunting by community members is allowed within delimited hunting zones, often using quota systems and rotation of zones and protected areas to allow repopulation of wildlife. Extractive concession owners and infrastructure developers may also provide workers with alternative animal protein sources, such as sustainably sourced and/or produced chicken or fish, in lieu of the use of wild meat where current or projected levels of demand exceed wild meat species' capacity to recover;

(b) Community conservancies. Hunting quotas are set by the state, based on annual game counts. The conservancies are managed by communities, who have rights to establish tourism enterprises and auction big game licenses according to national legislation. Conservancies are supported by law enforcement agencies which respond to conservancy information to apprehend and arrest poachers;

(c) Wildlife (or game) ranching comprises the maintenance of wild animals in defined areas delineated by fences. It is a form of husbandry similar to cattle ranching, the animals are managed on natural vegetation although the habitat may be manipulated to improve production efficiency in the framework of national legislation;

(d) Payment for Ecosystem Services schemes. Communities are paid on delivery of an ecosystem services. In this case, in accordance with national policies, they may be paid to maintain "food



stocks” at sustainable levels or even to maintain “carbon stocks” through sustainable hunting or strict conservation of key tree seed dispersers, respecting the cultural relation of indigenous peoples and local communities with wildlife. Population monitoring of the target species are conducted to measure the delivery of the service;

(e) Certification schemes. Certification has the potential to contribute to the conservation and sustainable use of wild species by influencing consumer choices for sustainably-sourced products. While most certification schemes certify products that are cultivated, harvested or produced without harming wildlife habitats or wildlife populations (such as wildlife-friendly wood; wildlife-friendly cocoa), there are also a few examples of certification schemes that certify “wildlife-based” products for being sustainably harvested (for example, peccary pelts, certified meat). Such certification schemes may also incorporate safeguards that would assure consumers that wild meat meets good sanitary standards. Certification schemes work well in societies that are ready to pay a premium price for products that respond to their ethics as consumers. The premium price received by the producer (a hunter, or a community) must cover the costs of certification, which are often high.

22. Elements for successful, sustainable community-based (or regional cooperative) wildlife management, to create the enabling conditions for local community management, may include, in accordance with national legislation:

(a) Communities have the social cohesion (i.e., they trust one another and feel kinship with their community neighbours) sufficient to take collective actions to address shared problems;

(b) Communities develop, or receive support to develop, benefit-sharing mechanisms for the sustainable use of wildlife over which they have traditional and legitimate claims. The right to benefit is devolved to the lowest community level, with support from the State to ensure that communities gain a just share of benefits from wildlife use;

(c) Rights over land and rights to manage and benefit from wildlife are clearly defined and recognized and defended by the State. The corresponding rights holders are identified and formally recognized to prevent non-rights holders (illegitimate users) from abusing the use of wildlife resources;

(d) Definition on geographical limits of those areas where community-rights-holders are able to collect wild meat is determined by national legislation taking into consideration their customary law;

(e) Local communities and hunters are explicitly interested in benefiting from their rights to use wildlife, including customary rights, but also take the responsibility to be accountable for its sustainability and habitat conservation. Communities have clear, acknowledged procedures for resolving policy and practice differences within the community or group;

(f) Clear regulatory frameworks exist or are created to allow for the sustainable use of wildlife by local community members, or groups of members, including procedures for determining and enforcing penalties on group members or whole communities if necessary;

(g) The structure, capacities and budgets of governmental institutions in charge of wildlife are adapted to play a key role in framing and facilitating sustainable use activities;

(h) There is clear national hunting legislation, and the effective enforcement of that legislation, which prevents actors from outside a community from undermining the legitimate authority and effectiveness of each governance authority;

(i) Administrative procedures are simplified, available in local languages, traceability systems strengthened and local leadership capacities developed;



(j) Community hunting zones, within and around protected areas, are clearly defined,<sup>19</sup> comply with a specific land use, and respect the management plans and conservation parameters of protected areas;

(k) A local governance authority is made responsible for each land-use zone. If the State is not devolving full control to the local authority (i.e. when the State retains responsibility for protected areas, species or local food security), then there should be clearly laid out criteria for assessment of good local governance and the consequences of poor governance. In cases where taxation or other forms of revenue stem from the land-use zone, then clear frameworks for financial management should also be set out, including penalties for misconduct;

(l) Government officials and local authorities have the skills and knowledge to develop sustainable wildlife management plans. Such knowledge should include traditional and customary sustainable use;

(m) Species that can or cannot tolerate harvesting are identified. Among those that can be harvested sustainably, species needing maximum harvesting quotas (and those such as pests needing minimum harvesting quotas) should be distinguished from species for which no quota is necessary. For species requiring maximum harvesting quotas, sustainable offtake rates should be calculated and adjusted on a regular basis;

(n) Systems to establish sustainable quotas, and monitor (by and with the communities) trends in target wildlife species, are established and rules for adaptation of offtakes are clearly set out, together with responsibility for enforcement and penalties for misconduct;

(o) Procedural rights of indigenous peoples and local communities, such as access to information, participation in decision-making and access to justice, should be guaranteed.

23. Legalization and taxation of the sales of some wildlife species can help enable communities to benefit from wildlife. This may not be feasible for countries that lack the required infrastructure and capacity, and an effective justice system that adheres to the principal of equal rights under the law and equal application of the law. In this regard, relevant organizations of the International Consortium on Combating Wildlife Crimes (ICWC) could also provide further support to national capacity-building of law enforcement, judiciary, prosecution and legislation to prevent illegal hunting.

24. In many countries, hunting regulatory frameworks need to be updated in order to adjust to their current situation and national realities. Otherwise, wildlife laws are difficult to apply and enforce, and are unlikely to be successful in reducing hunting pressure on key species and ecosystems. Moreover, compliance with outdated regulations implies high costs, which indigenous peoples and local communities cannot afford in the absence of compensatory measures.

25. There is a need to strengthen many countries' staff capacities and capabilities to effectively and fairly enforce wildlife laws. A lack of enforcement of national laws results in the illegitimate appropriation of indigenous peoples and local communities' traditional rights over wildlife by external hunters who lack legitimate rights to hunt on traditional lands. When indigenous peoples and local communities benefit from hunting, consuming and trading wildlife from their lands, they see poaching as stealing from them and are highly motivated to halt the illegal or illegitimate use of their wildlife.

26. There is ample evidence that hunting regulation, law enforcement and crime prevention are more effective when communities and authorities work together over the long term. Tried and proven, effective strategies are those that require long-term engagement on both sides, regulating hunting while also respecting and protecting the legitimate traditional rights of indigenous peoples and rural communities living with wildlife, defending community assets, and enabling local communities to sustainably manage and benefit from wildlife use and conservation. Communities can be the "eyes and ears" of law

---

<sup>19</sup> Land-use zones should delineate: (a) areas where hunting is strictly prohibited to allow for population recovery and protect undisturbed habitats for species very sensitive to human perturbation; (b) areas where some hunting is allowed through permits, licenses, etc.; (c) areas where hunting is less restricted, except for protected species.

enforcement by providing information to an arresting authority, such as the police and the national park service, which ensures the anonymity of informants, reducing the risk of retribution. Further action could also be taken to train indigenous peoples and local communities to perform roles of security enforcement and national park officers.

27. Suggested steps for managing and improving the sustainability of wild meat supply at the source:

(a) Review existing policies and legal frameworks:<sup>20</sup> States where wild meat use is common are strongly encouraged to review existing policies and legal frameworks related to the conservation and sustainable use of wildlife, including wild meat species management, in accordance with national circumstances and applicable national legislation, to include:

- (i) A rationalization of wildlife laws to focus on sustainability, ensure that they are fit-for purpose and can be properly applied and enforced, and with due consideration to both food security and conservation concerns;
- (ii) Devolution of wildlife rights to local populations, where appropriate, and in line with the Plan of Action on Customary Sustainable Use under the Convention, enhancing appropriate forms of land tenure, including ownership to increase their incentive to sustainably manage the resource and exert enforcement against external actors. In this, communities should be supported by a competent and trusted national agency with the authority to arrest and prosecute law breakers in a timely manner;<sup>21</sup>
- (iii) Development of guidelines distinguishing species that are resilient to hunting and those that are not, in order to inform the use and trade of species that can be hunted sustainably. Laws regulating hunting and trade should distinguish those wildlife species that reproduce rapidly (e.g., rodents and pigs) from those that do not (e.g., primates and most large bodied mammals). Legislation should be responsive enough to allow adaptive management, with quotas or other regulatory mechanisms recognizing a species' resilience to harvest;
- (iv) Where a system of taxation is being considered a full investigation of the current and required capacities, and the sustainability of the taxation system (i.e. that the revenues will cover the costs) is conducted;

(b) Strengthen law enforcement capacity:

- (i) Enforcement of national wildlife laws in partnership between the State and local communities, incentivizing biodiversity benefits for communities to cooperate and support conservation and sustainable use objectives;
- (ii) Strengthen investigative capacity, enhancing control, inspection and arresting procedures and methods, together with training and employment of indigenous peoples and local communities, including domestically and at border-crossing points;<sup>22</sup>

<sup>20</sup> The [IUCN Best Practice Guidelines No. 20](https://www.iccaconsortium.org/index.php/2015/08/08/governance-for-the-conservation-of-nature/) may be useful in this respect. Available at <https://www.iccaconsortium.org/index.php/2015/08/08/governance-for-the-conservation-of-nature/>

<sup>21</sup> There are CBD decisions on “indigenous and community conserved territories and areas” (also known as territories and areas conserved by indigenous peoples and local communities). See <https://www.iccaconsortium.org/index.php/international-en/conservation-en/>

<sup>22</sup> Decision VII/28, paragraph 22: “Recalls the obligations of Parties towards indigenous and local communities in accordance with Article 8(j) and related provisions and notes that the establishment, management and monitoring of protected areas should take place with the full and effective participation of, and full respect for the rights of, indigenous and local communities consistent with national law and applicable international obligations”.

- (iii) Enhance measures to protect the rights of indigenous peoples and local communities in enforcement activities, and to deter poaching;
- (iv) Enhance cooperation and coordination among wildlife trade enforcement officers and officials, prosecutors and judges and other relevant personnel in the implementation of the respective law, and enable prosecutors and judges to prosecute and sentence on cases of illegal wild meat harvest and trade;
- (v) Strengthen the capacity of fiscal, legal and judicial personnel on environmental laws and policies to increase their awareness, and effectiveness to address, crimes against wildlife;
- (vi) Promote awareness-raising campaigns for citizens, including indigenous peoples and local communities on national and local legislation and regulations;

(c) Develop and strengthen participatory processes in formulating and implementing the sustainable management and harvesting of wildlife, including wild meat species, with the participation of indigenous peoples and local communities, non-governmental organizations, the private sector and other relevant stakeholders:

- (i) Where appropriate, communities should be involved in the sustainable management of local wildlife resources. This can be achieved by recognizing and supporting territories and areas conserved by indigenous peoples and local communities (ICCAs), and by using a range of governance models, including community hunting zones, community conservancies, payment for ecosystem services and certification schemes, as well as biodiversity-friendly management models;
- (ii) Wildlife management, including wild meat species management, should be an essential part of the management or business plans for extractive industries (oil, gas, minerals, timber, etc.) operating in tropical and sub-tropical ecosystems. In relevant circumstances, contracts between government and infrastructure and extractive industry companies should provide food alternatives to wild meat for staff working in such concessions where demand exceeds or is projected to exceed the sustainable yield;
- (iii) Existing biodiversity safeguards and standards within extractive industry guidelines and policies should be identified, expanded where needed, applied and monitored. Fines and compensation measures should be applied in cases where companies default on such safeguards and standards;
- (iv) Sustainable wild meat management considerations could be further integrated into forest certification schemes<sup>23</sup> and criteria and indicator processes for sustainable forest management to mitigate the impacts of human activities on wildlife by including provisions for alternative, sustainable food sources and livelihoods, where needed, and for capacity-building and management systems that support legal and sustainable hunting, and effectively regulating the hunting of protected species.

(d) Substitution and other mitigative measures:

The development of culturally acceptable and economically feasible alternative food and income sources is essential where wildlife alone cannot be sustainably used to support current or future livelihood needs. Alternative food and income sources, however, need to take into account local realities, cultures and preferences and should be developed and implemented with indigenous peoples and local communities or

---

<sup>23</sup> Such as the Programme for the Endorsement of Forest Certification Schemes (PEFC) and the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC).

support community-based income projects. Mitigative measures (farming, ranching, captive breeding, etc.) may play a role in conserving wildlife resources.

**B. Reducing demand for unsustainably managed and/or illegal wild meat in cities and towns**

28. The global demand for animal protein is increasing due to a rapidly growing human population, urbanization, and increasingly successful global efforts to alleviate poverty. This is driving a dramatic increase in the demand for wildlife (both terrestrial and aquatic), and this demand is foreseen to accelerate over the coming decades. Demand for wild meat, as for other consumer goods, is influenced by price, consumer wealth, culture, the availability of substitutes and non-price factors, such as consumer preference, and who pays for the good.

29. At most income levels, when the price of wild meat increases relative to substitutes, consumers tend to reduce their wild meat consumption. However, where consumption of wild meat confers prestige on the consumer, wealthy households may be motivated to consume more as the price increases. There is limited information on how much the price of wild meat needs to rise, and the price of available substitutes needs to fall, before demand for wild meat will significantly decrease. This information is crucial when designing demand-reduction strategies for unsustainably managed wild meat species.

30. The price<sup>24</sup> of wild meat can be increased by increasing enforcement of wildlife laws, or by taxing wildlife sales and consumption. However, as mentioned above, this might not work so well where wild meat is consumed for reasons of prestige. Increasing prices can increase demand in certain luxury markets where the high price point and the social status it confers are a driver for consumption, and may also result in illegal meat being laundered into legal markets.

31. To ensure that wildlife populations are conserved while ensuring that consumers have continued access to sources of food, in many cases, substitutes for wild meat will need to be developed and produced in sufficient quantities. Livestock meat and fish can serve as substitutes for wild meat. However, in those cases where wild meat is an important part of the diet of rural communities, and can be regulated to ensure its sustainability, it may, in fact, be a better alternative than livestock production with its concomitant impacts on land-use change. In addition, assessments must be conducted to ensure that any increases on livestock and fishery production does not have adverse impacts on biodiversity and the environment, and is conducted sustainably.

32. The relative success of sustainable management of wild meat, as compared to substitutes will be dependent on the context, as will the choice among substitutes. In Central Africa, backyard poultry production may provide a suitable substitute, whereas in South America, where freshwater fish is an important component of the diet, sustainable fish production may be more suitable. The situation is different in savannah or grassland ecosystems (such as eastern and southern Africa), where wildlife and domesticated livestock have shared the same pastures for thousands of years.

33. Previous attempts to produce food and income substitutes for wild meat have generally been as part of small-scale “alternative livelihood” projects for rural communities. However, these projects have not provided substitutes at a scale needed to meet the growing demand, particularly in urban areas. Identification of the factors influencing the success or failure of such projects would allow the potential of alternative livelihood projects to be properly assessed, and the development of best-practice guidelines.<sup>25</sup>

34. Behavioural change interventions aim to influence the consumer choices and decisions in order to elicit a swifter response to the availability of meat substitutes. In the longer term, interventions might aim to reduce overall meat consumption in favour of plant-based alternatives. Media campaigns, often disseminated as radio plays or tele-novellas, attempt to reach large audiences from villages to cities, provide consumers with information designed to encourage them to shift their meat consumption to

---

<sup>24</sup> This may be the actual price or the shadow price (i.e. the estimated price of a good or service for which no market price exists).

<sup>25</sup> This would require substantial improvements in project monitoring and reporting. The development and application of suitable monitoring and evaluation frameworks should be a requisite for donor or government funding of projects.

alternatives, and promote certified wild meat products where relevant. Where young urbanites are already switching their preferences from wild meat, media campaigns can help to catalyse this change.

35. Rapidly growing provincial towns or remote urban settlements created by extractive industries (logging, mining, oil) are a critical entry point for managing the wild meat trade. Many residents still eat wild meat regularly due to the proximity to this resource and the highly limited availability of other animal source proteins, but are not fully reliant on it for their livelihoods. For rural villages with legitimate claims to manage and benefit from the sustainable use of wildlife within their traditional territories, a key solution to current open-access hunting is to assist rights holders to secure the authority and attain the capacity to control and manage the level of hunting on their lands, as discussed in subsection A. Natural resource extraction activities may be accompanied by an influx of workers that could potentially increase hunting pressure or alter the food supply in the region: companies should ensure a reliable protein source and set and enforce regulations for sustainable wild meat hunting and/or consumption by employees.

36. With rapidly increasing human populations and urbanization, large urban centres represent a significant and growing proportion of the overall consumption of wild meat in some countries. Increasing the availability of cheaper, sustainable substitutes through local production and importation is both possible and a priority. This should be combined, however, with a proper enforcement of wildlife use at wholesale, retailer and consumer levels.

37. Suggested steps for reducing demand for unsustainably managed and/or illegal wild meat in cities and towns:

(a) When necessary, develop demand-reduction strategies for unsustainably managed wildlife, focusing on towns and cities, using a cross-sectoral approach, in accordance with national circumstances and applicable national legislation:

- (i) Demand for wild meat is not an isolated environmental issue, and hence demand-reduction strategies should be developed cross-sectorally, with the involvement of government ministries responsible for health, food, agriculture, business, development, economy, finance, infrastructure, and education, as well as those responsible for the environment, and relevant experts in the fields of consumer behaviour change, including social marketing and behavioural economics, and in conjunction with the private sector and experts in fields that go beyond conservation;
- (ii) The development of effective demand reduction strategies must also include the active involvement of the relevant experts in the related fields of consumer behaviour change, including social marketing and behavioural economics;
- (iii) Demand-reduction strategies should focus principally on consumers in provincial towns and metropolitan cities, where a reduction in wild meat consumption can be achieved without impacting livelihoods or land rights. For provincial towns, close to sources of wildlife, a mix of formalization of short value chains based on the hunting of resilient species should be combined with strict enforcement especially for protected/vulnerable species, and the development of locally produced substitutes. For metropolitan cities, far from sources of wildlife, consumption is a consumer choice issue that may be best resolved through targeted social marketing to encourage behavioural change;
- (iv) Demand-reduction strategies should be informed by research focused on the identification of environmental, economic and cultural drivers, attitudes and motivations that influence consumption of wild meat, in order to develop strategies that also address these important drivers;

(b) Increase the availability of sustainably produced and sustainably-harvested substitutes, as appropriate:

- (i) An enabling environment should be developed and incentives provided to encourage the development of self-sufficient private enterprise and private-public partnerships to supply substitutes, such as sustainably produced / sustainably-harvested chicken, fish and other domestic livestock, in urban settlements which are sufficiently large (and have a large enough customer base). Assessments must be conducted to ensure that any increase of livestock and fishery production does not have adverse impacts on biodiversity and the environment, and that the production is sustainable;
  - (ii) Extractive and infrastructure industries that house their employees in close proximity to sources of wildlife should be required to ensure that their employees comply with applicable regulation concerning hunting of wild meat species and, where appropriate, have access to affordable and sustainably produced / sustainably-harvested sources of protein from livestock or sustainable system crops, sustainably and preferably domestically produced;
- (c) Decrease the availability and demand for unsustainably produced wild meat:
- (i) Targeted media campaigning (based on an understanding of the drivers of consumption and relevant substitutes), including the use of social media, in urban towns and cities should be used to inform citizens on issues pertaining to wild meat consumption, including wildlife conservation, human health issues, conservation impact, wildlife laws and available sustainably produced/ sustainably-harvested substitutes, with the aim of changing consumer behaviour. Campaigns should be designed based on a clear understanding of the consumers, drivers, and substitutes in the areas to be targeted;
  - (ii) Wildlife laws governing the trade and sales of wild meat (which are relevant, understandable, and enforceable) should be developed and applied in provincial towns, cities and villages, to encourage legal, sustainable and traceable trade, and provide a disincentive to illegal traders and increase urban wild meat prices. Prior assessments should be conducted in order to determine if increasing prices will increase demand in certain luxury markets and/or lead to increased illegal trade;
- (d) Promote responsible consumption of certified sustainably-sourced wild meat, since certification has the potential to contribute to the conservation and sustainable use of wild species by influencing consumer choices for sustainably-sourced products. Certification schemes could be developed to certify wild meat products as sustainably harvested, as well as meeting good sanitary standards. Such certified products can highlight benefits such as sustainability, local community livelihoods, conservation impact and health.

### **C. Creating the enabling conditions for a legal, regulated and sustainable wild meat sector**

38. At the international level, wild meat issues are considered via two main types of institutions: international conventions and platforms (CBD, CITES, CMS, the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES)) and other relevant organizations that help to support or implement the decisions of the conventions (CPW, Interpol, UNODC, ICCWC, TRAFFIC, UNCTAD, FAO, IUCN, UNDP) and regional cooperation or economic integration bodies (EU, AU, CEEAC) and other related multilateral institutions (EC, COMIFAC, among others).

39. Among wildlife issues, the question of the illegal wildlife trade is of prominent concern and, too often, sustainable wildlife management and wild meat issues are overlooked or are treated as a by-product of the work on the illegal wildlife trade. Some conventions<sup>26</sup> explicitly consider and act upon the unsustainable use of wild meat by trying to produce a more favourable environment for the conservation and sustainable use of wildlife.

---

<sup>26</sup> For example, CBD, CITES, CMS.

40. Management of the wild meat sector must move beyond ad hoc disconnected palliative measures intended to mitigate the effects of wildlife hunting (e.g. hunting bans, captive breeding of wild species, and small-scale alternative protein or livelihood options). A holistic approach along the wild meat value chains, focused on conserving and sustainably using the resource at the source (rural areas) and reducing the demand in urban centres, should be developed.

41. This will require a conducive and comprehensive enabling environment (particularly regarding national policy and legal frameworks concerning wildlife hunting, and wild meat trade and sales), which is currently absent in most developing countries. Creating such an enabling environment becomes the necessary condition to achieve or progress towards a more controlled, more sustainable wild meat sector. A coherent and focused governance framework is required at both the international and national levels in support of interventions targeting better management of the resource and/or a significant reduction of the demand.

42. The complexity of such a framework may require the development of a Theory of Change that can be used to think through and plan actions and interventions which address a specific societal or biodiversity problem. A Theory of Change maps out the logical steps that are needed for an intervention to lead to a desired outcome and ultimately to broader societal and conservation impacts.

43. Much of the current wild meat trade is not legal, and this can hinder policy processes and prevent a sound assessment of management requirements. There is an urgent need to include the wild meat sector formally within systematic national wealth accounting systems and GDP estimates.

44. Suggested steps for creating the enabling conditions for a legal, regulated and sustainable wild meat sector:

- (a) Increase international collaboration:
  - (i) Further enhance collaboration among the relevant conventions, platforms, and organizations (in particular: the Convention on Biological Diversity, the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES), Convention on Migratory Species (CMS), IPBES, the World Health Organization (WHO), the World Organization for Animal Health (OIE), and the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), the International Consortium on Combating Wildlife Crime (ICWC)), promoting the recommendations of the Bushmeat Liaison Group under the Convention on Biological Diversity;<sup>27</sup>
  - (ii) An integrated approach is needed that addresses poaching and illegal wildlife trade hand-in-hand with the equally important issues of food security, livelihoods and the sustainable use of wildlife. Efforts aimed at tackling poaching and illegal wildlife trade to be effective and sustainable in the long term, need to be complemented by efforts to ensure that the conservation and sound management of wildlife species takes into account the socio-economic needs of local communities, including the sustainable use of wild meat;
  - (iii) Support integrated local, national, and transboundary action to build partnerships among relevant organizations, institutions and other relevant stakeholders to: build enforcement and monitoring capacities; develop and implement alternatives for nutrition and livelihoods; and increase awareness, research exchanges and education regarding hunting of and trade in wild meat. In addition, there should be targeted action to advance the Action Plan on Customary Sustainable Use, as well as to support national processes to revise policy and legal frameworks to support and enable conservation and sustainable use of wildlife species;

---

<sup>27</sup> [CITES COP 17 \(Conf. 13.11\)](#), and CBD Conference of the Parties [decision XI/25](#).



(b) Acknowledge the role of wild meat, where legitimate, and adapt national policy and legal frameworks accordingly:

- (i) Recognize the reality of the existing wild meat trade, as a necessary precursor to getting wildlife management onto a sounder footing;
- (ii) Record levels of existing wild meat consumption into national statistics, as a means of valuing the resource and recognizing the benefits of its legal and sustainable use, and giving it appropriate weight in public policy and planning;
- (iii) Assess the role of wildlife consumption in livelihoods and consider it in national resource assessments and major policy planning documents, such as national development and poverty reduction strategies;
- (iv) Include wild meat/wildlife issues in relevant educational curricula (e.g. tertiary education, government training);
- (v) Recognize the important role of women in the processing and sale of wild meat, while taking into account the needs, priorities and capacities of women and men;

(c) Create regional and national monitoring frameworks for wild meat to inform policy and legal interventions, including:

- (i) To undertake an evaluation of wild meat consumers, the drivers of consumption and, where demand exceeds the sustainable yield potential substitutes, and the calculation of elasticities of demand. This knowledge is required for the design and targeting of demand-reduction strategies, including the development of behavioural change strategies to address sustainable wild meat consumption practices, including consumption of sustainable substitutes;
- (ii) To carry out an evaluation of wild meat suppliers, including the use of wild meat for protein and income, the characteristics of hunters and hunting households, the use of alternative sources of protein and income, and the impacts of hunting on local livelihoods;
- (iii) To generate a description of the wild meat commodity chain, to identify key actors and places along the commodity chain to target interventions;
- (iv) To design an ecological monitoring platform at key sites nationally to determine and track the impacts of wild meat hunting and the impacts of policy implementation;
- (v) To assess relative health benefits and risks from wild meat and alternatives in development planning (e.g., extractive industry operations), including both nutritional content and infectious disease risks, to inform supply options;
- (vi) To collate past and current interventions aimed at increasing the sustainability of wild meat use, and any evidence of their impact, to build an evidence-base of success and failures with which to better design future interventions;
- (vii) To make use of relevant, existing data platforms to develop a deeper understanding of the type of interventions needed, including their potential design, and opportunities for different stakeholders to contribute to data collection effort